

CJIS Board Meeting

August 5, 2008 – 1:00 PM- 2:00 PM

Chief Justice's Office ~ 1st Floor, Supreme Court

Attendees:

Chief Justice VandeWalle, Lisa Feldner, Pam Schafer, Chuck Placek, Sue Davenport, Brandi Fagerland, Nancy Walz, Leanne Bertsch, Amy Vorachek

Not in Attendance: Thomas L Trenbeath

- Approve minutes
 - Chief moves to approve minutes subject to any changes Tom may have. Lisa seconds. Minutes approved
- Bill Draft – Thomas L. Trenbeath
 - Tom was unable to attend. Pam suggested we hold a meeting. Chief VandeWalle is only available until the 27th. Pam will discuss with Tom.
 - Pam distributed the IJIS report. The one copy has suggested changes that were made by State Radio but they also made some changes to CJIS info which is not agreed upon. Chief VandeWalle, we have 2 different issues. In Greg's email, the text highlighted in red is what he believes, the text with a black line through, he is definite on. Lisa, one place they make a comment on CJIS – pg 13, FBI approval of the ORI with CJIS, Lisa and Pam agree this needs to come out. Chief VandeWalle, if this goes forward as it is, we need to write a letter to state we disagree with some of these statements. The consultants could state, we've noted your opinions but we are not going to change the report. Nancy thought Greg's reference was to their system; he was saying they have 2 different parts in their office and another in their cars. This should have been said to the consultant when they came out here. His tone has deflected the CJIS system to a public safety system, to include tornado warnings and everything. This may be something Tom may want to look at in the bill draft. The messaging switch and CJIS portal are overlapping. There's a place in here where LERMS was brought up with the number of people from State Radio and CJIS, this needs to come out. The Adjutant General thought they may have been defensive and overreacted to the study. The Chief agrees they may have. We need to bring the two together. Lisa meets with the Adjutant General this Thursday, after that meeting Lisa will touch base with Pam. Chief said he's free to submit this but we can chose not to use that type of approach to this report. The board's recommendation is to correct the inaccurate statements of the report.
- SAVIN – Amy Vorachek
 - Court's Notification - The Court's notification piece may be removed from the SAVIN Project Plan. The Chief asked if anyone knew this when we applied for the SAVIN grant? The Chief asked if needed to modify the current system or change to a new system. Does this indicate that we need to ask for some kind of exception? Amy explained that we need to add this in with the contract or we

- need to ask for an extension. With the grant we've applied for we already have had one extension. We have 90 days after grant expires before we expend those monies. The new Court system is expected to be live by June 2011. They are narrowing in on a date to be ready. We're going to have to ask legislature to re-appropriate the money. Chuck agrees if you interface with the current system, you will have to interface with the new system. Chuck thought the courts interfacing would be later in the project, with the hope to be SAVIN compliant as many vendors are SAVIN compliant. Amy said we definitely don't want to dump the courts, we are going to do everything with the grants and the contractors to keep this included. Chief asked if we should try to patch something together for the 1 to 2 years until we change. We would be wasting money and time and don't have the staff to do that. Amy is confident we will get a grant extension. Chief will write to support her. The Court piece is a good chunk of this. There isn't a lot for the courts handling notification to the victim but we need the courts info to keep info up to date. We'd have to take courts out of the project plan but leave them in the contract.
- Brandi Fagerland was introduced as the assigned large project oversight (LPO) analyst from the Information Technology Department. Brandi distributed LPO guidelines to explain the process Amy is following. This project is considered a large project as it falls within those guideline. Page 4 has the part that has been completed. This committee is considered the Executive Steering Committee. After Amy has the project plan together, the start-up of the project will be presented to the SITAC committee. Brandi discussed the process of large project oversight and reporting.
 - The reason we would want to take the Courts of the plan is that there was an area on page 6. Brandi's concern is the discussion that is taking place at this meeting. She sensed additional discussion was needed as the Courts project's timing is related to the SAVIN project. The plan was pretty high level.
 - Chief thinks we ought to keep the grantor in on what's going on. Chuck's concern is an audit. They could come in and say if you remove the courts how can this match? If you leave it in and explain as you go, the match will make even more sense.
 - Amy said we will be fine tuning the plan after the contract is signed. The contract is in the works. We're working with BCI, DOCR and contacting jails with info. Brandi will be a member and will be at these meetings. Amy will have a meeting with the VOCA grant administrator. SAVIN will take care of notifications and allow their time to be spent with the victim. Amy looks at the area where the victim is not getting notification at all. This will really help with that. Sometimes ignorance bliss with some victims. The statute says the burden is on the agency is to contact the victim. Now this puts it on the victim to register to be notified. Those who haven't been contacted, will now have this available. Nancy, the next steps then to help the Court understand what it takes on their side, would it help to have someone from SAVIN to meet with them to go over what is needed. Amy thinks that would be a good idea. One of the Court's vendors was Appriss compliant. Maybe we could put it in our contract to say that the vendor will be here to work with the Court to get it in there. Chief agrees.
 - Chief thinks full disclosure to the grantor is the best plan.

- Timing of this project and the Court's project is important. Courts project has talked of SAVIN compliance. It has been on their radar.
- Contract document will be reviewed by the AG's legal staff. Appriss has been a good vendor to work with. Amy has talked to others who stated they really liked their appendixes. Amy thinks they will agree with it as other states have used it.
- After this meeting, Amy and Chuck are meeting with legislative council to work on a bill draft that the interim judiciary committee has requested. They want to clear up conflicts and draft a bill. Chuck's concern is the effective date to be given to the legislature. They have set the middle of August for that meeting. Amy doesn't think this will impact it. It will just give substance to SAVIN. It is incorporating the fair treatment standards and to have the language to read well.
- Current code requires community notification and the victim has to be notified. Chief doesn't know the victim and victim could be out of reach or have moved. The bill draft would allow the victim to register with SAVIN and would have to have the victim notify if they change their address. Sex offender is different because it is a lifetime offender. Chuck, speaking for enforcement, they are concerned. This has been a struggle to notify the victims. Chief said they are lucky to be working with Vonette.
- Amy said the next meeting for the Executive Steering Committee is August 29th. The intent is to have a contract that is ready for authority to sign. Lisa said we should have a combined monthly meeting of the CJIS Board and SAVIN Executive Steering Committee. All agreed and may have to allow more time for meeting.
- The contract will be submitted to Appriss tomorrow. Amy will have the AG's office take a look at it first.
- Chuck is concerned with the effective date as it may need to be staggered. They may have to delegate some authority there. Chuck indicated to the committee that we could be off 2 to 3 years for implementation.

Meeting Adjourned 2:03 pm.